

### **REMARKS**

In the present application, claims 1-19 were pending. Claims 1, 4-7, 10, 11, 13, and 16-18 are rejected. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 15 are objected to. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are canceled. Claims 2-4, 8-10, and 14-16 are amended. Claim 19 is allowed. As a result of this amendment, claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-19 are in condition for allowance.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 15 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but noted that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 15 have been so amended are therefore in condition for allowance. In addition, independent claims 1, 7, and 13, upon which the objected to claims formerly depended, have been canceled. Lastly, claims 4, 10, and 16 have been amended to reflect changes in dependency necessitated by the cancellation of claims 1, 7, and 13.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 5 as being anticipated by Yun et al. (5,866,988). As described above, claim 1 has been cancelled. As a result, the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 is rendered moot. Applicants wish to expressly state that the cancellation of claims 1, 7, and 13 is not for reasons related to the patentability of such claims and the Applicants reserve the right to file a continuation application at such time as is appropriate to continue prosecution of the canceled claims. For the reasons stated above, claim 2 is in condition for allowance. As claims 4 and 5 depend upon claim 2, they are likewise in condition for allowance.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 10, 11, 13, and 16, and 17 as being unpatentable over Yun et al. As discussed above, claims 7 and 13 have been canceled rendering the Examiner's grounds for rejection moot. Claims 10 and 11 now depend upon claim 8 while claims 16 and

S.N. 10/004,477  
Amdt. Dated September 16, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005

17 now depend upon claim 14. As claims 8 and 14 are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above, claims 10, 11, 16, and 17 are likewise in condition for allowance.


The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 18 as being unpatentable over Yun et al. in view of Barratt et al. (5,592,490). For the reasons discussed above, claim 6 now depends on claim 2 and claim 18 depends upon claim 14. As claims 2 and 14 are in condition for allowance, claims 6 and 18 are likewise in condition for allowance.


An earnest and thorough attempt has been made by the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues in this case and place same in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues which remain in this application after consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be gratefully appreciated.

S.N. 10/004,477  
Amdt. Dated September 16, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005

It is submitted that the claims herein patentably define over the art relied on by the Examiner and early allowance of same is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey R. Ambroziak  
Reg. No.: 47,387

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245  
email: jambroziak@hspatent.com

S.N. 10/004,477  
Amdt. Dated September 16, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

9/20/2005  
Date

Clairne F. Mian  
Name of Person Making Deposit